



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the second place, I did not say or suggest that Miss Lowell lacks intellect. On the contrary, I am inclined to think that no one not extraordinarily intellectual and extraordinarily prolific of ideas could write the polyphonic prose with even moderate success. I do not believe, for example that Wordsworth could by any possibility have written polyphonic prose. I do not mean simply that he would have refused to have anything to do with it, or that he was incapable of understanding it: I mean that if he had understood the theory of polyphonic prose and had wanted to write it, he would have been unable to make a passably good showing in it, because I do not believe that he possessed the intellectual subtlety, or the variety and abundance of ideas, that appear to me necessary to make the polyphonic prose even tolerable.

Perhaps the difficulty is, after all, simply that Miss Lowell "goes too fast" for me. I accept this explanation as good so far as it goes: but I am obliged to look farther. Assuming that the whole truth of the matter is that Miss Lowell goes too fast for me, how can I explain to myself the fact that Shakespeare, or Browning, or Francis Thompson, does not go too fast for me. I do not, of course, mean to imply that Miss Lowell ought to have written the works of Shakespeare, Browning, or Francis Thompson, any more than in my review I meant to suggest that it was a pity that she had not written *Kubla Khan*. The question is at present solely concerning rapidity. When I approach the subject from this point of view, I find myself arriving at the same conclusion as before. Miss Lowell's rapidity is not wholly due, I think, to the fact that her thoughts throng thick, or to the fact that the subtlety of her ideas makes them hard to follow: it is due in part to the fact that whereas the older poets formally defined their thoughts, conserving the interests of matter-of-fact thinking and making each word quite as much a part of a definite statement as a challenge to imagination, Miss Lowell, playing up the suggestion or connotation of her words in what is to me a rather bewildering fashion, constrains me to proceed from suggestion to suggestion rather than from idea to idea, and thus more or less effectually baffles my desire to think in the usual way even when I am reading highly imaginative poetry. Such is my imperfect and possibly erroneous explanation of the phenomenon which Miss Lowell calls her going too fast for me. C. G.

Canton, New York.

CONSTITUTIONS AND TREATIES

SIR,—I have recently run across some old statements that seem to be particularly appropriate at the present time.

In Bourrienne's *Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte*, Vol. II., page 217, will be found a reference to the opinion which Napoleon entertained for the Constitution of the French Republic while he was still the First Consul. My opinion is that some people in this country seem to regard our own Constitution in about the same light, since the absentee referred to has taken upon himself the direction of all affairs of state.

At the time in question, there had arisen in the Council of the French Republic, a consideration of the manner in which treaties of peace should be concluded. Some of the members of the Council were of

the opinion that "conformably with an article of the Constitution, the treaties should be proposed by the head of the Government, submitted to the Legislative Body, and after being agreed to, promulgated as part of the laws." Bonaparte thought differently, and said:

It is for the mere pleasure of opposition that they appeal to the Constitution, for if the Constitution says so it is absurd. There are some things which cannot become the subject of discussion in a public assembly; for instance, if I treat with Austria, and my ambassador agrees to certain conditions, can those conditions be rejected by the legislative body? It is a monstrous absurdity! Things would be brought to a fine pass in this way! * * * This would be a fine way to manage matters!

The principal difference between Bonaparte's method of handling such a difficulty and that of our present Executive is merely one of degree. It is due to the strength of the United States Constitution as compared to that of the old French Republic. The First Consul of France had the power and the arrogance to override the Constitution of the Republic, which was not a well-established document, one which the people of the nation were able to uphold. Bonaparte had in his own hands the power to change the forms as he saw fit, though the power was that of a military dictator, entirely unlawful. In our country such changes cannot be made so easily. The Senate will not be driven like a herd of cattle when the Executive cracks a whip over their backs.

Today the United States Senate stands in the same position that Daniel Webster suggested in his great speech concerning the Omnibus bill on the floor of the Senate, February 5, 1850, in answer to John C. Calhoun of South Carolina. Webster said:

It is fortunate that there is a Senate of the United States; a body not yet moved from its propriety, nor lost to a just sense of its own dignity and its own high responsibilities, and a body to which the country looks with confidence for wise, moderate, patriotic, and healing counsels.

It is truly fortunate that the United States Senate is a body not easily moved from its propriety. It is indeed fortunate that there are men in the Senate who have the courage to stand for the maintenance of our ancient system, even when a false cry that a "League of Nations" will keep us out of war has created impressions in the minds of many of our people that there is only one decent side to the controversy. Though these preachers of the coming millennium may sway the multitudes to a greater or less extent, their words will not be sufficient to swing the Senate unless there should be in the various measures under discussion enough benefit to America right now to make them a practical substitute for our traditional foreign policy.

When it becomes necessary for the Senators to exercise their Constitutional rights and duties in regard to the treaty of peace and whatever extraneous matter may be "so interwoven into the fabric thereof," the people will doubtless have much cause to render thanks for the fathers of the nation, who not only established the foreign policy which some people now seem to consider entirely out of date, but also wrote the marvellous document under which the Government lives and the Senate will act. We have the fathers to thank for our prosperity under the policy we have always followed, and we have them to thank for the

fact that no one man,—however unusual his ability in the art of governing men and however inordinate his ambition,—can tear down the structure which they reared upon such a solid foundation.

PIERCE P. FURBER.

Minneapolis, Minn.

WHY FRANCE WANTS A SECURE PEACE

SIR,—As a Frenchman I have been asked by friends why I was dissatisfied with the attitude of President Wilson at the Peace Conference.

First of all, I must say that I am entitled to speak as a fighting man. During the war I was always in a platoon of infantry. I have been wounded three times, and badly sick once at the front.

Besides my own impressions and opinions, I will give those of the troopers with whom I lived. They were, like myself, of pure French blood and education. The feelings of dissatisfaction I am to express are not directed against the American people at large, because I have met many Americans meaning well and doing well. I know that amongst the people of the business and political world, France has good and sincere friends in the United States, but I am sorry to observe that these friends of ours are not represented by President Wilson.

It is stated that the majority of Americans do not approve the Peace terms. This may be so, but this fact would bring a contradiction into the lime-light. Democracy has been defined: "The government of the people, by the people and for the people." So President Wilson, who advocates the rights of democracy against autocracy, must represent the American people or not be a democrat. In that case, I am forced to conclude: America is against France. If that is not true, I must say: America is an autocracy under President Wilson.

France and Belgium were attacked by the Germans who wanted to rule over them and over the world. So we didn't make war through any imperialistic view, but to defend ourselves. Later on we could have made a settlement with Germany, but we didn't want to because the fate of civilization was involved in the issue of this war. These facts are well known in America. Ambassador Gerard in the Foreword of his book, *My Four Years in Germany*, says: "America was forced into the war by the bad principles and deeds of the Germans." Thus it will be absolutely unfair to consider Germany as anything else than a well-organized society of robbers and criminals who didn't succeed in carrying out their scheme. In civilized countries, Justice does not make agreements with criminals, but punishes them. Germany has to be punished and has to pay for damages of the war. This nation (Germany) cannot be destroyed or her people wiped out, but it is possible to prevent her being a danger for the world. To obtain these results, two things are necessary:

First, encourage the provincial feelings of her people, and suppress the unity of the German government.

Second, strengthen the neighbors of Germany and make them safe